

AP9641

REMARKS

Claim 15 has been cancelled and no new claims have been added. Claims 10-14 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 10 - 14 remain under prosecution in this application.

In the Title

The title was objected to because it was not descriptive of the invention. The title has been changed to make it more descriptive of the claimed invention.

Abstract of the Disclosure

The abstract was objected to because it did not set forth the gist of the invention. A new abstract is submitted herewith which more closely focuses on the claimed invention and accordingly, the undersigned believes that the objection to the abstract of the disclosure is now overcome.

General Objections

Claim 10 was objected to because the Examiner believes that it is unclear as to "what 4-pole connection" is. The undersigned has amended claim 10 to now state "a 4-pole connection". It is clear from page 4, the substitute specification, paragraph 19, and Figure 1A, that a 4-pole connection is synonymous with a 4-wire connection.

Claim 13 was objected to because it is unclear to the Examiner what "functional elements" are. Claim 13 has been amended to eliminate the term "functional elements" and to introduce "means for" language. Support for the claimed amendments is found in paragraph 20 of the substitute specification, clean copy.

Claim 15 is objected to because the term "flexation" is not clearly understood. Although claim 15 has been cancelled and accordingly, this objection is overcome, the concept of tire sidewall deformation (which is synonymous with tire sidewall flexation) is clearly set forth in paragraph 3 of the substitute specification, clean copy.

AP9641

35 USC §103

Claims 10 through 15 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Loreck et al. in view of Adachi.

Claim 10 has been amended to specifically recite that a first housing contains at least one converter element and **no signal processing unit**. Additionally, claim 10 has been amended so that the second housing includes a signal processing unit and **no converter element**. Support for this structural arrangement is found throughout the specification,

including Figure 2. Additionally, claim 10 has been amended to specifically point out and distinctly claim that the first housing is "operatively coupled to a sidewall of a vehicle tire...".

None of the references of reference teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Loreck teaches that there are signal processing units (SC1 to SC4) embedded in the first housing (function unit 12 – see specifically column 4, lines 52 – 56 of Loreck). Claim 10, as amended, precludes this configuration. Additionally, neither Loreck nor Adachi teach or suggest operatively coupling the first housing to a sidewall of the vehicle tire. This is important to the claimed invention because it specifically relates to sidewall torsion sensors. Neither Loreck nor Adachi teach or suggest application of their sensing system to sidewall torsion sensor applications.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the undersigned believes that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 64098-0890 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 5, 2004


Joseph V. Coppola, Sr.

Registration No. 33,373

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

39533 Woodward Avenue

Suite 140

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304

248-594-0650

Attorney for Applicant

FAX RECEIVED

JAN 6 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800